

ON ULTRAPRODUCTS OF BOOLEAN ALGEBRAS AND IRR

SAHARON SHELAH

Institute of Mathematics
The Hebrew University
Jerusalem, Israel

Rutgers University
Mathematics Department
New Brunswick, NJ USA

ANOTATED CONTENT

§1 Consistent inequality

[We prove the consistency of $\text{irr}(\prod_{i<\kappa} B_i/D) < \prod_{i<\kappa} \text{irr}(B_i)/D$ where D is an ultrafilter on κ and each B_i is a Boolean Algebra. This solves the last problem of this form from the Monk's list of problems in [M2], that is number 35. The solution applies to many other properties, e.g. Souslinity.]

§2 Consistency for small cardinals

[We get similar results with $\kappa = \aleph_1$ (easily we cannot have it for $\kappa = \aleph_0$) and Boolean Algebras B_i ($i < \kappa$) of cardinality $< \beth_{\omega_1}$.]

This article continues Magidor Shelah [MgSh 433] and Shelah Spinus [ShSi 677], but does not rely on them: see [M2] on background.

I would like to thank Alice Leonhardt for the beautiful typing.

This research was supported by The Israel Science Foundation founded by the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities. Publication 703.

Typeset by $\mathcal{A}\mathcal{M}\mathcal{S}$ -TEX

§1 CONSISTENT INEQUALITY

1.1 Definition. Assume $\mu < \lambda$, λ is strongly inaccessible Mahlo. Let $B^* = B_\lambda$ be the Boolean Algebra freely generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ and for $u \subseteq \lambda$ let B_u be the subalgebra of B^* generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in u\}$.

1) We define a forcing notion $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ as follows:

$p \in \mathbb{Q}$ iff: for some $w^p = w[p]$ we have:

- (i) $w^p = w[p] \subseteq \lambda$
- (ii) $B^p = B[p]$ is a Boolean Algebra of the form $B_{w[p]}/I^p$ where $I^p = I[p]$ is an ideal of $B_{w[p]}$ so B^p is generated by $\{x_\alpha/I : \alpha \in w^p\}$
- (iii) $x_\alpha/I \notin \langle \{x_\beta/I : \beta \in w^p \cap \alpha\} \rangle_{B[p]}$, equivalently $x_\alpha \notin \langle \{x_\beta : \beta \in w^p \cap \alpha\} \cup I \rangle_{B_{w[p]}}$
- (iv) for every strongly inaccessible $\chi \in (\mu, \lambda]$ we have $|w^p \cap \chi| < \chi$.

The order is $p \leq q$ iff $w^p \subseteq w^q$ and $I^p = I^q \cap B_{w[q]}$, so abusing notation we think $B^p \subseteq B^q$, not distinguishing sometime x_α from $x_\alpha/I \in B^p$ or (see below) from $x_\alpha/\bar{I}$ in $\bar{B}$.

2) We define $\bar{I} = \cup \{I^p : p \in G_{\mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \kappa}^1}\}$ and $\bar{B}$ is defined as $B_\lambda/\bar{I}$.

1.2 Claim. For $\mu < \lambda$ as in Definition 1.1, the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ is μ^+ -complete (hence, add no new subsets to μ), has cardinality λ , satisfies the λ -c.c., collapse no cardinal, change no cofinality, so cardinal arithmetic is clear.

Proof. Like Easton forcing.

1.3 Claim. For the forcing $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ with μ, λ as in Definition 1.1 we have

- 1) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ “ $\bar{B}$ is a Boolean Algebra generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda\}$ such that $\alpha < \lambda \Rightarrow x_\alpha \notin \langle \{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \rangle_{\bar{B}}$, so $|\bar{B}| = \lambda$ ”.
- 2) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ “ $\text{irr}^+(\bar{B}) = \lambda = \text{irr}(\bar{B})$ ”, see definition 1.4 below.
- 3) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}}$ “if $y_\beta \in \bar{B}$ for $\beta < \lambda$ then for some $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \lambda$ we have $\bar{B} \models y_{\beta_1} \cap y_{\beta_2} = y_{\beta_0}$ ”.
- 4) Let B^* be a finite Boolean Algebra generated by $\{a^*, b^*, y_0^*, \dots, y_{n(*)}^*\}$ such that $y_m^* \notin \langle \{y_\ell^* : \ell < m\} \cup \{a^*, b^*\} \rangle$, $0 < a^* < y_\ell^* < b^* < 1$.

Then it is forced, $(\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\mu,\lambda}^1})$ that:

if $y_\beta \in \underline{B}$ for $\beta < \lambda$ and $\beta \neq \gamma \Rightarrow y_\beta \neq y_\gamma$ then we can find a, b in $\underline{B}$ satisfying $0 < a < b < 1$ and $\beta_0 < \dots < \beta_{n(*)} < \lambda$ such that

(α) $\underline{B} \models "a < y_{\beta_\ell} < b"$

(β) there is an embedding f of B^* into $\underline{B}$ mapping a^* to a , b^* to b and y_ℓ to $y_{\beta_\ell}^*$ for $\ell = 0, \dots, n(*)$.

Recalling

1.4 Definition. For a Boolean Algebra B let:

- 1) $X \subseteq B$ is called irredundant, if no $x \in X$ belongs to the subalgebra $\langle X \setminus \{x\} \rangle_B$ of B generated by $X \setminus \{x\}$.
- 2) $\text{irr}^+(B) = \cup \{|X|^+ : X \subseteq B \text{ is irredundent}\}$.
- 3) $\text{irr}(B) = \cup \{|X| : X \subseteq B \text{ is irredundent}\}$ so $\text{irr}(B)$ is $\text{irr}^+(B)$ if the latter is a limit cardinal and is the predecessor of $\text{irr}^+(B)$ if the later is a successor cardinal.

Remark. Concerning 1.3 on the case $\kappa = \aleph_1$, see Rubin [Ru83], generally see [Sh 128], [Sh:e].

Proof of 1.3. 1) Should be clear.

2) Clearly for every $\chi < \lambda$ and $p \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mu,\lambda}^1$ we can find $\alpha < \lambda$ such that $\alpha > \chi$ and $w^p \cap [\alpha, \alpha + \chi) = \emptyset$ hence we can find q such that $p \leq q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mu,\lambda}^1$ and $w^q = w^p \cup [\alpha, \alpha + \chi)$ and in B^q the set $\{x_\beta : \beta \in [\alpha, \alpha + \chi)\}$ is independent, hence $q \Vdash " \text{irr}^+(B) > \chi "$. So we get $\Vdash " \text{irr}^+(B) \geq \lambda "$. To prove equality use part (3).

3) Assume toward contradiction that $p \Vdash " \langle y_\beta : \beta < \lambda \rangle \text{ is a counterexample} "$. We can find for each $\beta < \lambda$ a quadruple $(p_\beta, n_\beta, \langle \alpha_{\beta,\ell} : \ell < n_\beta \rangle, \sigma_\beta)$ such that:

- (i) $p \leq p_\beta \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mu,\lambda}^1$
- (ii) $n_\beta < \omega$
- (iii) $\alpha_{\beta,\ell} \in w^{p_\beta}$ increasing with ℓ
- (iv) $\sigma_\beta(x_0, \dots, x_{n_\beta-1})$ is a Boolean term
- (v) $p_\beta \Vdash " \text{in } \underline{B} \text{ we have } y_\beta = \sigma_\beta(x_{\alpha_{\beta,0}}, x_{\alpha_{\beta,1}}, \dots, x_{\alpha_{\beta,n_\beta-1}}) "$ call the latter y_β , so by part (1) without loss of generality $\{\alpha_{\beta,\ell} : \ell < n_\beta\} \subseteq w^{p_\beta}$ hence y_β is a member of $B_{w[p]}$.

So we can choose a stationary $S \subseteq \{\chi : \chi \text{ strongly inaccessible, } \mu < \chi < \lambda\}$ and $n, \sigma, m, \langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < m \rangle, w, r$ such that for every $\beta \in S$ we have: $n_\beta = n$ & $\sigma_\beta = \sigma, \ell < m \Rightarrow \alpha_{\beta, \ell} = \alpha_\ell, \ell \in [m, n) \Rightarrow \alpha_{\beta, \ell} \geq \beta$ and $w^{p_\beta} \cap \beta = w$. Without loss of generality also $\alpha < \beta \in S \Rightarrow w^{p_\alpha} \subseteq \beta$. Without loss of generality for β_0, β_1 in S the mapping $F_{\beta_0, \beta_1} = \text{id}_w \cup \{(\langle \alpha_{\beta_0, \ell}, \alpha_{\beta_1, \ell} \rangle : \ell < n)\}$ induces an isomorphism g_{β_1, β_0} from the Boolean Algebra $\langle \{x_\gamma : \gamma \in w\} \cup \{\alpha_{\beta_0, \ell} : \ell < n\} \rangle_{B[p_{\beta_0}]}$ onto the Boolean Algebra $\langle \{x_\gamma : \gamma \in w\} \cup \{x_{\beta_1, \ell} : \ell < n\} \rangle_{B[p_{\beta_1}]}$ that is g_{β_1, β_0} maps x_γ to x_γ for $\gamma \in w$ and maps $x_{\beta_0, \ell}$ to $x_{\beta_1, \ell}$ for $\ell < n$. Choose $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2$ and we define $q \in Q_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ such that $w^q = w[p_{\beta_0}] \cup w[p_{\beta_1}] \cup w[p_{\beta_2}]$ and B^q is the Boolean Algebra generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in w[p_{\beta_0}] \cup w[p_{\beta_1}] \cup w[p_{\beta_2}]\}$ freely except the equations which hold in p_{β_ℓ} for each $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ and the equation $y_{\beta_1} \cap y_{\beta_2} = y_{\beta_0}$, in other words I^q is the ideal of B_w^q generated by $I[p_{\beta_0}] \cup I[p_{\beta_1}] \cup I[p_{\beta_2}] \cup \{y_{\beta_1} \cap y_{\beta_2} - y_{\beta_0}, y_{\beta_0} - y_{\beta_1} \cap y_{\beta_2}\}$. We should prove that $q \in Q_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ and $I[q] \cap B[p_{\beta_\ell}] = I[p_{\beta_\ell}]$ for $\ell = 0, 1, 2$ (the rest: $p_{\beta_\ell} \leq q$ hence $p \leq q$ and $q \Vdash "y_{\beta_\ell} = y_{\beta_\ell} \text{ for } \ell = 0, 1, 2 \text{ and } y_{\beta_1} \cap y_{\beta_2} = y_{\beta_0}"$ should be clear). Let B_0 be the trivial Boolean Algebra $\{0, 1\}$.

For $w \subseteq \lambda$ and $f \in {}^w 2$ let $\hat{f}$ be the unique homomorphism from the Boolean Algebra B_w freely generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha \in w\}$ to $\{0, 1\}$ such that $\alpha \in w \Rightarrow \hat{f}(x_\alpha) = f(\alpha)$. For $p^* \in Q_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ let $\mathcal{F}[p^*] = \{f : f \in ({}^{w^{p^*}} 2) \text{ and } \{x_\alpha : f(\alpha) = 1\} \cup \{-x_\alpha : f(\alpha) = 0\} \text{ generates an ultrafilter of } B[p^*]\}$. For each $f \in \mathcal{F}[p^*]$ let $f^{[p^*]}$ be the homomorphism from $B[p^*]$ to B_0 induced by f , i.e. $f^{[p^*]}(x_\alpha) = f(\alpha)$ for every $\alpha \in w$. Clearly $\mathcal{F}[p^*]$ gives all the information on p^* . Define $u = w^{p_{\beta_0}} \cup w^{p_{\beta_1}} \cup w^{p_{\beta_2}}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F} &= \{f : f \in {}^u 2, \text{ and } \ell \leq 2 \Rightarrow f \restriction w[p_{\beta_\ell}] \in \mathcal{F}[p_{\beta_\ell}] \text{ and} \\ &\quad B_0 \models "\hat{f}(\sigma(\langle x_{\beta_1, \ell} : \ell < n \rangle)) \cap \hat{f}(\sigma(\langle x_{\beta_2, \ell} : \ell < n \rangle)) \\ &\quad = \hat{f}(\sigma(\langle x_{\beta_0, \ell} : \ell < n \rangle))"\}. \end{aligned}$$

We need to show that $\mathcal{F}$ is rich enough, clearly $\otimes_1 + \otimes_2 + \otimes_2$ below suffice

$\otimes_1$ if $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$ and $f_\ell \in \mathcal{F}[p_{\beta_\ell}]$ then there is $f \in \mathcal{F}$ extending f_ℓ .

[Why? For $m = 0, 1, 2$ let p'_{β_m} be the subalgebra of $B[p_{\beta_m}]$ generated by $\{x_\gamma : \gamma \in w[p_{\beta_m}] \text{ and } \gamma < \beta_m \vee \gamma \in \{\alpha_{\beta_m, 0}, \dots, \alpha_{\beta_m, n-1}\}\}$. We define a homomorphism h_ℓ from p'_{β_ℓ} to B_0 as $f_\ell^{[p_{\beta_\ell}]} \restriction B[p'_{\beta_\ell}]$ and define for $m = 0, 1, 2$ a homomorphism g_m from $B[p'_{\beta_m}]$ to B_0 such that: $\gamma \in w \Rightarrow g_m(x_\gamma) = f_\ell(\gamma)$ and $\gamma = \beta_{m, k} \Rightarrow g_m(x_\gamma) = f_\ell(\beta_{\ell, k})$. The definitions are compatible and let h_m be h_ℓ if $\ell = m$ and any homomorphism from $B[p_{\beta_m}]$ to B_0 extending g_m if $m \in \{0, 1, 2\} \setminus \{\ell\}$, clearly exist. Let $f_m \in {}^{w[p_{\beta_\ell}]} 2$ for $m = 0, 1, 2$ be $f_m(\gamma) = h_m(x_\gamma)$; for $m = \ell$ the definitions are compatible. Lastly let $f = f_0 \cup f_1 \cup f_2$, easily $f_\ell \subseteq f \in \mathcal{F}$.]

$\otimes_2$ if $\ell \in \{0, 1, 2\}$, $\alpha \in w[p_{\beta_\ell}]$ then there are $f', f'' \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f'(\alpha) \neq f''(\alpha)$ but $f' \upharpoonright (\alpha \cap u) = f'' \upharpoonright (\alpha \cap u)$.

[Why? As $p_{\beta_\ell} \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ we can find $f'_\ell, f''_\ell \in \mathcal{F}[p_{\beta_\ell}]$ such that $f'_\ell(\alpha) \neq f''_\ell(\alpha)$ but $f'_\ell \upharpoonright (\alpha \cap w[p_{\beta_\ell}]) = f''_\ell \upharpoonright (\alpha \cap w[p_{\beta_\ell}])$. Now for $m \in \{0, 1, 2\} \setminus \{\ell\}$ let $f'_m \in \mathcal{F}[p_{\beta_m}]$ extends $f'_\ell \circ F_{\beta_\ell, \beta_m}$ and $f''_m \in \mathcal{F}[p_{\beta_m}]$ extends $f''_\ell \circ F_{\beta_\ell, \beta_m}$ both times as in the proof of $\otimes_1$. If $\ell = 0$, let $f' = f'_0 \cup f'_1 \cup f'_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ and let $f'' = f''_0 \cup f''_1 \cup f''_2 \in \mathcal{F}$ and we are done. Also if $\alpha < \beta_\ell$ (so $\alpha \in \bigcap_{m \leq 2} w[p_{\beta_m}]$) the same proof works. So assume

$\ell \neq 0, \alpha \notin \bigcap_{m \leq 2} w[p_{\beta_m}]$. If $(f'_\ell)^{[p_{\beta_\ell}]}(y_{\beta_\ell}) = (f''_\ell)^{[p_{\beta_\ell}]}(y_{\beta_\ell})$ let $f' = f'_0 \cup f'_1 \cup f'_2, f'' = f''_0 \cup f''_1 \cup f''_2 \cup (f' \upharpoonright (w[p_{\beta_0}] \cup w[p_{\beta_{3-\ell}}]))$, clearly O.K. So without loss of generality assume $(f'_\ell)^{[p_{\beta_\ell}]}(y_{\beta_\ell}) = 0, (f''_\ell)^{[p_{\beta_\ell}]}(y_{\beta_\ell}) = 1, \ell \in \{1, 2\}$ and $\alpha \in w[p_{\beta_\ell}] \setminus w[p_{\beta_0}]$; and then choose $f' = f'_0 \cup f'_1 \cup f'_2$ as above and $f'' = f''_\ell \cup (f' \upharpoonright (w[p_{\beta_0}] \cup w[p_{\beta_{3-\ell}}]))$. Now check; the main point is that as $\hat{f}'_{3-\ell}(y_{\beta_{3-\ell}}) = \hat{f}'_0(y_{\beta_0})$ we have $B_0 \models \hat{f}''(y_{\beta_1}) \cap \hat{f}''(y_{\beta_2}) = \hat{f}''(y_{\beta_\ell}) \cap \hat{f}''(y_{\beta_{3-\ell}}) = \hat{f}''_\ell(y_{\beta_\ell}) \cap \hat{f}'(y_{\beta_{3-\ell}}) = 1_{B_0} \cap \hat{f}'_{3-\ell}(y_{\beta_{3-\ell}}) = \hat{f}'_{3-\ell}(y_{\beta_{3-\ell}}) = \hat{f}'_0(y_{\beta_0}) = \hat{f}''(y_{\beta_0})$.

4) Similar proof (with a, b now in $p_{\beta_\ell} \upharpoonright \beta_\ell$!).

□_{1.3}

1.5 Claim. 1) If $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1 * \mathbb{Q}^2$ and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1} \text{“}\mathbb{Q}^2 \text{ satisfies the } (\lambda, 3)\text{-Knaster condition (see below)”, then } \Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{“irr}^+(B) = \lambda\text{”}$.

2) For 1.3(4), “ $(\lambda, n^* + 1)$ -Knaster” suffice to preserve the condition.

3) In part (1) we even get the conclusion of Claim 1.3(3).

1.6 Definition. 1) The λ -Knaster condition says that among any λ members there is a set of λ which are pairwise compatible. Recall that it is preserved by composition.

2) For $n^* \leq \omega$, the $(\lambda, n^* + 1)$ -Knaster condition says that among any λ member there is a set of λ such that any $< 1 + n^*$ of them has a common upper bound.

Proof of 1.5. 1), 3) Clearly it suffices to prove (3).

Straight by 1.4(3), in fact, just such $\mathbb{Q}^2$ preserves the properties mentioned there in 1.5.

2) Similarly using 1.4(4).

□_{1.5}

1.7 Theorem. *Suppose*

- (a) $\mathbf{V}$ satisfies GCH above μ (for simplicity)
- (b) κ is measurable, $\kappa < \chi < \mu$
- (c) μ is supercompact, Laver indestructible, in fact,
 - (*) for some $h_\ell : \mu \rightarrow \mathcal{H}(\mu)$, (for $\ell = 0, 1$) we have for every $(< \mu)$ -directed complete forcing $\mathbb{Q}$, cardinal $\theta \geq \mu$ and $\mathbb{Q}$ -name $\dot{x}$ of a subset of θ , there is in $\mathbf{V}[G_{\mathbb{Q}}]$ a normal ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on $[\theta]^{<\mu}$ such that

$$\prod_{a \in [\theta]^{<\mu}} (h_1(a \cap \mu), h_2(a \cap \mu)) \cong (\theta, \dot{x}[G_{\mathbb{Q}}])$$
- (d) $\lambda > \mu$ is strongly inaccessible, Mahlo and λ^* such that $\lambda^* = (\lambda^*)^\mu \geq \lambda$
- (e) D^* is a normal ultrafilter on κ .

Then for some forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ we have, in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$:

- (α) forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ collapse no cardinal of $\mathbf{V}$ except those in the interval (μ^+, λ)
- (β) forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ add no subsets to χ
- (γ) μ is strong limit of cofinality κ and $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of strong limit cardinals with limit μ
- (δ) for each $i < \kappa$, $\mu_i < \lambda_i \leq \lambda_i^* = (\lambda_i^*)^{\mu_i} = 2^{\mu_i}$ and we let $\mu_\kappa = \mu$, $\lambda_\kappa = \lambda$, $\lambda_\kappa^* = \lambda^*$
- (ε) for each $i \leq \kappa$ we have: B_i is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ_i and $\text{irr}^+(B_i) = \lambda_i$
- (ζ) for $i < \kappa$, λ_i is a Mahlo cardinal even strongly inaccessible, but
- (η) $\lambda = \lambda_\kappa$ is μ^{++} (this in $V^{\mathbb{P}}$)
- (θ) $B = B_\kappa$ is isomorphic to $\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D^*$, hence

$$\boxtimes \quad \text{irr}^+(B) = \lambda = \mu^{++} \text{ so } \text{irr}(B) = \mu^+ \text{ whereas } \text{irr}(B_i) = \text{irr}^+(B_i) = \lambda_i$$

$$\text{and } \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_i / D^* = \lambda, \text{ so } \text{irr}(\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D^*) < \prod_{i < \kappa} \text{irr}(B_i) / D^*.$$

Proof. Let $\mathbb{Q}_1 = \mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1$ and B be from 1.2, let $\mathbb{Q}_2$ be $\{f : f \text{ a partial function from } \lambda^* \text{ to } \{0, 1\} \text{ with domain of cardinality } < \mu\}$ ordered by inclusion, let $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2$. Let $G = G_1 \times G_2 \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}$ and let $\mathbf{V}_0 = \mathbf{V}$, $\mathbf{V}_1 = \mathbf{V}[G_1]$ and $\mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}[G] = \mathbf{V}_1[G_2]$.

- ⊠₀ In $\mathbf{V}_2, \bar{B}[G_1]$ is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ with $\text{irr}^+(B) = \lambda$ and notational simplicity with a set of elements λ .
 [Why? In $\mathbf{V}_1, \bar{B}[G_1]$ is like that by 1.3. Now as in $\mathbf{V}_1, \mathbb{Q}_2$ satisfies the (λ, n) -Knaster for every n clearly by 1.5 we are done.]

In $\mathbf{V}_2$ the cardinal μ is still supercompact, hence it is well known that

- ⊠₁ for every $Y \subseteq 2^\mu$ for some normal ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on μ and $\bar{Y} = \langle Y_i : i < \mu \rangle, Y_i \subseteq 2^{|i|}$ we have $\bar{Y}/\mathcal{D}$ is Y (i.e. $\bar{Y}/\mathcal{D} \in \mathbf{V}_2^\mu/D$ and in the Mostowski Collapse of $\mathbf{V}_2^\mu/\mathcal{D}$ the element $\bar{Y}/\mathcal{D}$ is mapped to Y), hence $(2^\mu, Y, \mu, <)$ is isomorphic to $\prod_{i < \mu} (2^{|i|}, Y_i, i, <)/\mathcal{D}$.

Again it is well known and follows from ⊠₁ that there is a sequence $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^0 = \langle \mathcal{D}_\zeta^0 : \zeta < (2^\mu)^+ \rangle$ of normal (fine) ultrafilters on μ satisfying: for each $\zeta < (2^\mu)^+$ the sequence $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^0 \upharpoonright \zeta$ belongs to (the Mostowski collapse of) $\mathbf{V}_2^\mu/\mathcal{D}_\zeta$. In $\mathbf{V}_2$ we can code $\bar{B} = \bar{B}[G_1]$ and $\mathcal{P}(\mu)$ and $\bar{\mathcal{D}}^0 \upharpoonright \kappa$ as a subset Y of $2^\mu = \lambda^*$ and get $\mathcal{D}, \bar{Y}$ as in ⊠₁ hence for some set $A \in \mathcal{D}$ of strongly inaccessible cardinals $> \chi$ there is a sequence $\langle (\mu_i, \lambda_i, B_i, \lambda_i^*) : i \in A \rangle$ such that:

- (*)₁ for $i \in A$ we have $i = \mu_i < \lambda_i \leq \lambda_i^* = (\lambda_i^*)^{\mu_i}$, λ_i is weakly inaccessible, Mahlo, B_i is a Boolean Algebra generated by $\{x_\alpha : \alpha < \lambda_i\}, x_\alpha \notin \langle \{x_\beta : \beta < \alpha\} \rangle_{B_i}$, $\text{irr}^+(B_i) = \lambda_i$ and, for notational simplicity, its sets of elements is λ_i
 (*)₂ B is isomorphic to $\prod_{i \in A} B_i/\mathcal{D}$ and $(\lambda^*, <) \cong \prod_{i \in A} (\lambda_i^*, <)/\mathcal{D}$.

Let $A^* = \{i < \mu : i \text{ strong inaccessible } > \chi\}$. For $i \in \mu \setminus A$ choose $\mu_i, \lambda_i, \lambda_i^*, B_i$ such that (*)₁ holds so $\mu_i = i$; why are there such λ_i, B_i ? Just e.g. use $\lambda_{\text{Min}(A \setminus i)}, B_{\text{Min}(A \setminus i)}$.

Let $\mathcal{D}_i = \mathcal{D}_i^0$ for $i < \kappa$ and $\mathcal{D}_\kappa$ be the $\mathcal{D}$ as above. So $\mathcal{D}_i$ (for $i \leq \kappa$) is a normal ultrafilter on μ and we have $i < j \leq \kappa \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_i \in \mathbf{V}_2^\mu/\mathcal{D}_j$, that is, there is $\bar{g} = \langle g_{i,j} : i < j \leq \kappa \rangle, g_{i,j} \in {}^\mu(\mathcal{H}(\mu))$ such that $\mathcal{D}_i$ is (the Mostowski collapse of) $g_{i,j}/\mathcal{D}_j \in \mathbf{V}_2^\mu/\mathcal{D}_j$.

All this was in $\mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}[G]$. So we have $\mathbb{Q}$ -names $\bar{g} = \langle g_{i,j} : i < j \leq \kappa \rangle, \bar{\mathcal{D}} = \langle \mathcal{D}_i : i \leq \kappa \rangle$ and $\langle (\mu_i, \lambda_i, B_i, \lambda_i^*) : i < \mu \rangle$. As $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2$, $\mathbb{Q}_2$ satisfies the μ^+ -c.c. and $\mathbb{Q}_1$

is μ^+ -complete without loss of generality $\bar{g}$ is from $\mathbf{V}[G_1]$, so as we could have forced first with some $\{f \in \mathbb{Q}_2 : \text{Dom}(f) \subseteq B\}, B \in [\lambda^*]^{\leq \mu}$; without loss of generality $\bar{g}$ and $\langle (\mu_i, \lambda_i, B_i, \lambda_i^*) : i < \mu \rangle$ belong to $\mathbf{V}$. Let $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ be (the $\mathbb{Q}$ -name of the)

Magidor forcing for $(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ (see [Mg4]). Let $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ be the $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ -name of the

increasing continuous κ -sequence converging to μ which the forcing adds and we can restrict ourselves to the case $\mu_0 > \chi$. Clearly clauses $(\alpha) - (\zeta)$ in the conclusion hold for $\mathbb{P} = \mathbb{Q} * \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$. Now

$\boxtimes_2$ in $\mathbf{V}_2$, if $p \in \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ and $p \Vdash "f \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_{\mu_i}"$ then there are q , an extension of p in $\mathbb{P}(\bar{D}, \bar{g})$ and $f \in \prod_{i \in A^*} \lambda_i$ such that $q \Vdash_{\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})} "\{i < \kappa : f(i) = f(\mu_i)\} \in D^*" .$

[Why? By the properties of $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ there are a pure extension q_0 of p in $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ and sequence $\langle u_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ such that above q_0 we have: $f(i)$ depends just on $\langle \mu_j : j \in u_i \cup \{i\} \rangle$ where $u_i \subseteq i$ is finite. As D^* is a normal ultrafilter on κ , for some $a^* \in D^*$ and finite $u \subseteq \kappa$ we have $i \in a^* \Rightarrow u_i = u$. So there is q such that $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g}) \models q_0 \leq q$ and $q \Vdash "\mu_j = \mu_j^*" for $j \in u$, and so f is well defined.]$

Let $G_3 \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}_2$ and $\mathbf{V}_3 = \mathbf{V}_2[G_3]$ and let $\mu_i = \mu_i[G_3]$ so really $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is generic for $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$. Now by $\boxtimes_2$ it follows that:

$\boxtimes_3$ in $\mathbf{V}_3 = \mathbf{V}_2[G_3]$ we have

$$B \cong \prod_{i < \kappa} B_{\mu_i} / D^* .$$

[Why? In $\mathbf{V}_2$ there is an isomorphism F from B onto $\prod_{i < \mu} B_i / \mathcal{D} = \prod_{i \in A^*} B_i / \mathcal{D}_\kappa$,

so let $F(x) = f_x / \mathcal{D}_\kappa$ with $f_x \in \prod_{i \in A^*} \lambda_i$ for $x \in B$, i.e. $x \in \lambda$.

In $\mathbf{V}_3$ let $f'_x \in \prod_{i < \kappa} \lambda_{\mu_i}$ be $f'_x(i) = f_x(\mu_i)$ and we define a function F' from

B , i.e. from λ to $\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D^*$ by $F'(x) = f'_x / D^*$. Now $B \in \mathcal{D} \Rightarrow \{i < \kappa : \mu_i \in B\} = \kappa \bmod J_\kappa^{bd}$ by the definition $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$, so as F is one to one also F' is, and F' commute with the Boolean operations as F does; last F' is onto by $\boxtimes_2$.]

$\boxtimes_4$ if $i < \kappa$ then $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})^{\mathbf{V}_3}$ is the same as $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})^{\mathbf{V}_0^{\mathbb{P}_i}}$, for some μ_i^+ -centered forcing notion from $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})$ (hence this forcing notion is λ_{μ_i} -Knaster).

[Why? Note that $\mathcal{H}(\mu_j)^{\mathbf{V}_2} = \mathcal{H}(\mu_j)^{\mathbf{V}_0}$ for $j \leq \kappa$. Also for each $i < \kappa$ in $\mathbf{V}_0$ there are $\mathcal{D}_j^i$, a normal ultrafilter on μ_i such that $(\bar{\mathcal{D}}^i, \bar{g}^i) = (\langle \mathcal{D}_j^i : j \leq i \rangle, \langle g_{j_1, j_2} \upharpoonright \mu_i : j_1 <$

$j_2 \leq i\rangle) \in \mathbf{V}$ is as above, i.e. $j_1 < j_2 \leq i \Rightarrow \mathcal{D}_{j_1}^i = g_{j_1, j_2} / \mathcal{D}_{j_2}^i \in \mathbf{V}^{\mu_i} / \mathcal{D}_{j_2}^i, g_{j_1, j_2}^i \in {}^{\mu_i}(\mathcal{H}(\mu_i))$ so $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}^i, \bar{g}^i)$ is as in [Mg4], and for some $G_{3,i} \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\langle \mathcal{D}_j^i : j \leq i \rangle, \langle g_{j_1, j_2}^i \upharpoonright \mu_i : j_1 \leq \mu_2 \leq i \rangle)$ generic over $\mathbf{V}_0$ (equivalently over $\mathbf{V}_2$) we have $G_{3,i} \in \mathbf{V}_3$ and $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})^{\mathbf{V}_3} = \mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})^{\mathbf{V}_2[G_{3,i}]} = \mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})^{\mathbf{V}_0[G_{3,i}]}$. See [Mg4]. As $\mathbb{P}(\bar{D}^i, \bar{g}^i)$ is μ_i -centered, clearly $\boxtimes_4$ follows.]

So obviously (by 1.5)

$\boxtimes_5$ in $\mathbf{V}_3$, for each $i < \kappa$ we have B_i is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ_{μ_i} , $\text{irr}^+(B_{\mu_i}) = \lambda_{\mu_i}$, λ_{μ_i} is weakly Mahlo.

Also in $\mathbf{V}[G_1]$, the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}_2$ satisfies the λ -Knaster condition and in $\mathbf{V}_2 = \mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2]$, the forcing notion $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ from [Mg1] is μ -centered hence satisfies the λ -Knaster hence

$\boxtimes_6$ in $\mathbf{V}_3$, B is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality λ , a Mahlo cardinal and $\text{irr}^+(B) = \lambda$.

Now let $\mathbb{R} = \text{Levy}(\mu^+, < \lambda)^{\mathbf{V}} = \{f \in \mathbf{V} : \text{Dom}(f) \subseteq \{(\alpha, \gamma) : \alpha < \lambda, \gamma < \mu^+\}, |\text{Dom}(f)| \leq \mu \text{ and for } \gamma < \alpha, \text{ we have } f(\alpha, \gamma) < 1 + \alpha\}$, ordered by inclusion. Clearly $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the λ -Knaster condition, is μ^+ -complete in $\mathbf{V}$ and also in $\mathbf{V}_1$. Let $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ be generic over $\mathbf{V}_1$. Now in $\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_{\mathbb{R}}]$, the forcing notion $\mathbb{Q}_2$ has the same definition and same properties. Also (as in [MgSh 433], [ShSi 677]), in $\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2, G_{\mathbb{R}}]$ the $\mathcal{D}_i (i \leq \kappa)$ are still normal ultrafilters on μ and the definition of $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ gives the same forcing notion with the same properties and add the same family of subsets to κ (as $\mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2]} = \mathcal{P}(\kappa)^{\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2, G_{\mathbb{R}}]}$).

So $G_{\mathbb{R}}$ is a subset of $\mathbb{R}$ generic over $\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2, G_3]$. Also in $\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2]$, $\mathbb{R}$ satisfies the λ -Knaster condition and in $\mathbf{V}[G_1, G_2, G_{\mathbb{R}}]$, $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ is μ -centered hence satisfies the λ -Knaster condition. Let $\mathbf{V}_4 = \mathbf{V}_3[G_{\mathbb{R}}]$, so in $\mathbf{V}_4$ all the conclusions above holds but $\lambda = \mu^{++}$ hence $\text{irr}(B) = \mu^+$ whereas $\text{irr}^+(B)$ remains $\lambda = \mu^{++}$. So we are done. $\square_{1.7}$

1.8 Claim. 1) In the theorem 1.7 we can replace

“a Boolean Algebra B of cardinality λ , $\text{irr}^+(B) = \lambda$ ” by e.g. “a λ -Souslin tree”

The “ λ strongly inaccessible Mahlo” is needed just for applying 1.3, etc, but for $\prod_{i < \kappa} B_i / D^* \cong B$ is not needed (any model M , with universe $\subseteq \lambda$ is O.K.)

2) We can apply the proof above to the proof in [Sh 128] hence to theorem in logics with Magidor Malitz quantifiers.

Proof. Similar to 1.7.

§2 CONSISTENCY FOR SMALL CARDINALS

Theorem 2.1 generalizes 1.7 in some ways. First D^* , instead of being a normal ultrafilter on κ is just a normal filter which is large in appropriate sense so later can be applied to the case $\kappa = \aleph_1$ (after a suitable preliminary forcing). Second, we deal with a general model and properties. Thirdly, the forcing makes μ to $\beth_\kappa$ (and more)

2.1 Theorem. *Suppose*

- (a) $\mathbf{V}$ satisfies GCH above μ (for simplicity)
- (b) κ is regular uncountable, $\aleph_0 \leq \theta \leq \kappa < \chi < \mu < \vartheta < \lambda \leq \lambda^* = (\lambda^*)^\mu$, say $\vartheta = \mu^+$
- (c) μ is supercompact, Laver indestructible or just indestructible λ^* -hypermeasure (see exactly [GM])
- (d) D^* is a filter on κ including the clubs and if f is a pressing down function on κ then for some $u \in [\kappa]^{<\theta}$ we have $\{\delta < \kappa : f(\delta) \in u\} \in D^*$
- (e) $\mathbb{Q}_1$ is a $(< \mu)$ -directed complete forcing, $|\mathbb{Q}_1| \leq \lambda^*$ and $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_1} \text{“}\bar{M} \text{ is a model with universe } \lambda \text{ and vocabulary } \bar{\tau} \in \mathcal{H}(\chi)\text{”}$
- (f) $\mathbb{R}$ is a μ^{++} -complete forcing notion of cardinality $\leq \lambda^*$
- (g) $\mathbb{Q}_2$ is the forcing of adding λ^* μ -Cohen subsets to μ and $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2$ (see below Definition 2.1(a)).

Then for some forcing notion $\mathbb{P}$ we have $\mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2 \times \mathbb{R} \triangleleft \mathbb{P}$ and in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$:

- (α) forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ collapse no cardinal except those collapsed by $\mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{R}$, in fact $\mathbb{P}/(\mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2 \times \mathbb{R})$ is ϑ^- -centered
- (β) forcing with $\mathbb{P}$ add no subset of χ , forcing with $\mathbb{P}/\mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2 \times \mathbb{R}$ satisfies $\boxtimes_{\gamma, \mu, \vartheta, \lambda, \lambda^*}^1$ from Definition 2.2 below as witnessed by $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$
- (γ) $\mu_i = \mu_i[G_{\mathbb{P}}]$, μ is strong limit of cofinality κ and $\langle \mu_i : i < \kappa \rangle$ is an increasing continuous sequence of strong limit singulars with limit μ (and $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{i+1})$ satisfies a parallel of the statement $\boxtimes_4$ from the proof of 1.7),
- (δ) for each $i < \kappa$ we have $\mu_i < \lambda_i \leq \lambda_i^* = (\lambda_i^*)^{\mu_i}$ and $\mu_\kappa = \mu$, $\lambda_\kappa = \lambda$, $\lambda_\kappa^* = \lambda^*$ and $(\mu_i, \lambda_i, \lambda_i^*)$ is quite similar to $(\mu, \lambda, \lambda^*)$ (see proof), more specifically: in some intermediate universe $\mathbf{V}_1$, for some normal ultrafilter $\mathcal{D}$ on μ and $F, F_* : \mu \rightarrow \mu$ we have $\prod_{i < \mu} (F(i), <)/D \cong (\lambda, <)$, $\lambda_i = F(\mu_i)$ and

- $\prod_{i < \mu} (F_*(i), <)/\mathcal{D} \cong (\lambda^*, <)$ and $F_*(\mu_i) = \lambda_i^*$ and we have $\bar{M} = \langle M_i : i < \mu \rangle$
and M_i a model with universe λ_i and vocabulary τ ; and $\prod_{i < \mu} M_i/\mathcal{D} \cong M$
- (ε) for $i < \kappa$ we have $2^{\mu_i} = \lambda_i^*$ and $2^{\lambda_i^*} = \mu_{i+1}$
- (ζ) $\prod_{i < \kappa} M_{\mu_i}/D^*$ is isomorphic to M if D^* is a normal ultrafilter, in fact,
 $\{\langle f(\mu_i) : i < \kappa \rangle / D^* : f \in \mathbf{V}_1 \text{ and } f \in \prod_{i < \mu} F(i)\}$ is the universe of
 $\prod_{i < \kappa} M_{\mu_i}/D^*$
- (η) for every $f \in \prod_{i < \kappa} M_i/D^*$ we can in $\mathbf{V}_1$ find $\varepsilon(f) < \theta$ and $g_{f,\varepsilon} \in \prod_{i < \mu} F(i)$
for $\varepsilon < \varepsilon(f)$ such that $\{i < \kappa : \bigvee_{\varepsilon < \varepsilon(f)} f(i) = g_{f,\varepsilon}(\mu_i)\} \in D^*$
- (θ) $\prod_{i < \kappa} (\lambda_i, <)/D^*$ is λ -like linear ordering (not necessarily well ordering as possibly $\theta > \aleph_0$)
- (ι) if D^* is a normal ultrafilter, $Q_1 = Q_{\mu,\lambda}^1$ (of 1.1) and $\mathbb{R} = \text{Levy}(\mu, < \lambda)$,
then the conclusion on irr in 1.7 holds.

2.2 Definition. 1) We say $\boxtimes_{\gamma,\mu,\vartheta,\lambda^*}(\mathbb{Q})$ or we say $\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies $\boxtimes_{\gamma,\mu,\vartheta,\lambda^*}$ (as witnessed by $(\bar{\mu}, \mathcal{D})$) iff:

- (i) $\mathbb{Q}$ is a forcing notion of cardinality $\leq \lambda^*$
- (ii) $\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies the ϑ -c.c.
- (iii) $\mathbb{Q}$ (i.e. forcing with $\mathbb{Q}$) add a sequence $\langle \mu_i : i < \gamma \rangle$ of cardinals $< \mu$, strongly inaccessible in $\mathbf{V}$, strong limit in $V^{\mathbb{Q}}$
- (iv) $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{“}\mu_i (i < \gamma) \text{ is increasing continuous”}$
- (v) $\mathcal{D}$ is a normal ultrafilter on μ
- (vi) for every $p \in \mathbb{Q}$ for some $\beta < \gamma$ for $A \in \mathcal{D}$ there is q satisfying $p \leq q \in \mathbb{Q}$ such that $q \Vdash \text{“}\{\mu_i : \beta < i < \gamma\} \subseteq A\text{”}$
- (vii) if γ is a limit ordinal then $\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}} \text{“}\mu = \bigcup_{i < \gamma} \mu_i\text{”}$
- (viii) in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}$ we have $2^\mu = \lambda^*$ and μ is strong limit.

2) We say $\boxtimes_{\gamma,\mu,\vartheta,\lambda^*}^+(\mathbb{Q})$ or we say $\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies $\boxtimes_{\gamma,\mu,\vartheta,\lambda^*}^+$ (as witnessed by $(\bar{\mu}, f_\theta, f_{\lambda^*})$ if:

- (a) $\mathbb{Q}$ satisfies $\boxtimes_{\gamma,\mu,\vartheta,\lambda^*}$ as witnessed by $\bar{\mu} = \langle \mu_i : i < \gamma \rangle$
- (b) if $G \subseteq \mathbb{Q}$ is generic over $\mathbf{V}$ then for every $\beta < \gamma$ we have $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{\beta+1})^{\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{Q}}}$ is gotten from $\mathcal{H}(\mu_{\beta+1})^{\mathbf{V}}$ by a forcing $\mathbb{Q}_{\beta+1}$ which is like $\mathbb{Q}$ for β .

Proof. Like the proof of 1.7 but we use [GM] instead of [Mg4]; note that $\vartheta = \mu^{+3}$ comes from making the forcing μ^{+3} -c.c. So the pure decision of $\mathbb{P}(\bar{\mathcal{D}}, \bar{g})$ is changed accordingly. Of course, the change in the assumption on D^* also has some influence. $\square_{2.1}$

So we get e.g.

2.3 Conclusion: Assume $\mathbf{V}$ satisfies ZFC + μ is a supercompact + “ $\lambda > \mu$ is strong inaccessible”.

1) For some forcing extension $\mathbf{V}^*$, for some ultrafilter D^* on ω_1 there is $\langle \lambda_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ such that:

- (i) for $i < \omega_1$, λ_i is weakly inaccessible $< \beth_{\omega_1}$
- (ii) $\lambda = \beth_{\omega_1}^{++}$
- (iii) the linear order $\prod_{i < \omega_1} (\lambda_i, <)/D^*$ is λ -like, λ_i first weakly inaccessible $> \beth_i$ (or first Mahlo $> \beth_i$).

2) In part (1) we have: for some sequence $\langle B_i : i < \omega_1 \rangle$ of Boolean Algebras, each of cardinality $< \beth_{\omega_1}$ we have $\text{Length}(\prod_{i < \omega_1} B_i/D^*) < \prod_{i < \omega_1} \text{Length}(B_i)/D^*$.

3) If λ in $\mathbf{V}$, $\lambda > \mu$ is Mahlo, also with irr.

Proof. 1) We start getting by forcing using a forcing notion from $\mathcal{H}(\mu)$ (see [Sh:f, Ch.XVI,2.5,p.793] and history there) a normal filter D^0 on ω_1 such that $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/D^*$ is layered¹ and $\diamond_{\aleph_1} + 2^{\aleph_1} = \aleph_2$. Hence (see [FMSH 252] and history there) there is an ultrafilter D^* on ω_1 extending D as required in 2.1 clause (d) for $\theta = \aleph_1$, that is: if $g \in {}^{\omega_1}\omega_1$ is pressing down on some member of D then for some $\alpha < \omega_1$, $\{\beta < \omega_1 : g(\beta) < \alpha\} \in D$. Now apply 2.1 with $\theta = \aleph_1, \mathbb{R} = \text{Levy}(\mu^+, < \lambda), \lambda$ inaccessible.

¹it means that this Boolean Algebra is $\bigcup_{i < \omega_2} B_i^*$, B_i^* is a Boolean Algebra of cardinality $\aleph_1$, increasing continuous with i , and $\text{cf}(i) = \aleph_1 \Rightarrow B_i \triangleleft \mathcal{P}(\omega_1)/D^*$

2) The proofs in [MgSh 433] applies also in our changed circumstances.
 3) But for irr the problem seems more involved. We use 2.5 below instead of 1.3 and note that $\mathbb{Q}_2, \mathbb{R}$ and the Gitik Magidor forcing $\mathbb{P}/(\mathbb{Q}_1 \times \mathbb{Q}_2 \times \mathbb{R})$ though not fully preserving $(*)_{\lambda, < \mu, \underline{B}}$ of 2.5 below it still leaves preserved for us $(*)_{\lambda, \aleph_0, \underline{B}}$ which is enough as we now prove. So in $\mathbf{V}^{\mathbb{P}}$ let $f_\alpha/D^* \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_{\mu_i}/D^*$ so $f_\alpha \in \prod_{i < \kappa} B_{\mu_i}$ for $\alpha < \lambda$. For each α we can find in $\mathbf{V}_2$ a sequence $\langle g_{\alpha, n} : n < \omega \rangle, g_{\alpha, n} \in \prod_{i < \mu} B_i$ such that $\{i < \omega_1 : (\exists n)(f_\alpha(i) = g_{\alpha, n}(\mu_i))\} \in D^*$. Without loss of generality we have $A_{\alpha, n} = A_n$ where $A_{\alpha, n} = \{i < \omega_1 : f_\alpha(i) = g_{\alpha, n}(\mu_i)\}$, as $2^{\aleph_1} < \beth_{\omega_1} < \lambda = \text{cf}(\lambda)$. Now in $\mathbf{V}_1$, there is an isomorphism $\mathbf{j}$ from $\prod_{i < \mu} B_i/\mathcal{D}$ onto B , so $\mathbf{j}(g_{\alpha, n}/\mathcal{D}) \in B$. In $\mathbf{V}_2[G_{\mathbb{R}}]$ we apply $(*)_{\lambda, \aleph_0, B}$ and find $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \beta_3 < \lambda$ such that $n < \omega \Rightarrow \mathbf{j}(g_{\beta_0, n}/\mathcal{D}) = \sigma(\mathbf{j}(g_{\beta_0, n}/\mathcal{D}), \mathbf{j}(g_{\beta_1, n}/\mathcal{D}), \mathbf{j}(g_{\beta_2, n}/\mathcal{D}), \mathbf{j}(g_{\beta_3, n}/\mathcal{D}))$ where σ is the Boolean term $\sigma^*(x_0, x_1, x_2) = (x_0 \cap x_1) \cup (x_0 \cap x_2) \cup (x_1 \cap x_2)$. Hence

$$Y_n =^{df} \{\zeta < \mu : B_\zeta \models g_{\beta_0, n}(\zeta) = \sigma^*(g_{\beta_1, n}(\zeta), g_{\beta_2, n}(\zeta), g_{\beta_3, n}(\zeta))\} \in \mathcal{D}$$

hence $Y = \bigcap_{n < \omega} Y_n \in \mathcal{D}$ hence for some $i^* < \kappa, (\forall i)[i^* \leq i < \kappa \rightarrow \mu_i \in Y]$ but $\mu_i \in Y \Rightarrow (\forall n < \omega)[B_{\mu_i} \models g_{\beta_0, n}(\mu_i) = \sigma(g_{\beta_1, n}(\zeta), g_{\beta_2, n}(\zeta), g_{\beta_3, n}(\zeta))]$. As $A_{\beta_\ell, n} = A_n$ we are done. $\square_{2.3}$

2.4 Remark. 1) In 2.3(1),(2) without loss of generality $\beth_{\omega_1}$ is the limit of the first ω_1 (weakly) inaccessible.
 2) In 2.3(3) without loss of generality $\beth_{\omega_1}$ is the limit of the first ω_1 Mahlo (weakly) inaccessible. Can we omit Mahlo?
 3) Of course, 2.3 is just one extreme variant.

2.5 Claim. 1) For $\mathbb{Q} = \mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1, \underline{B}$ as in 1.3 we have, for $\tau < \mu$ it is forced $(\Vdash_{\mathbb{Q}_{\mu, \lambda}^1})$ that:

$(*)_{\lambda, \tau, \underline{B}}$ if $y_{\alpha, \varepsilon} \in \underline{B}$ for $\alpha < \lambda, \varepsilon < \tau$ then for some $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \beta_3$ we have
 $\varepsilon < \tau \Rightarrow y_{\beta_0, \varepsilon} = \sigma^*(y_{\beta_1, \varepsilon}, y_{\beta_2, \varepsilon}, y_{\beta_3, \varepsilon})$ where $\sigma^*(y_1, y_2, y_3) = (y_1 \cap y_2) \cup (y_1 \cap y_3) \cup (y_2 \cap y_3)$.

2) If B is a Boolean Algebra, $\tau < \lambda$ and $\mathbb{Q}^*$ is τ^+ -complete (or just do not add new τ -sequence of ordinals $< |B|$) and satisfies the $(\lambda, 4)$ -Knaster property (i.e. among

any λ conditions there are λ , any three of them has a common upper bound), then forcing by $\mathbb{Q}^*$ preserve $(*)_{\lambda,\tau,B}$.

Proof. 1) As in 1.3 again the point is checking $(*)_{\lambda,\mu,B}$ so let $p \Vdash \langle y_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \beta < \lambda, \varepsilon < \tau \rangle$ be a counterexample. For each $\alpha < \lambda$ choose p_α such that $p \leq p_\alpha$ and $p_\alpha \Vdash \langle y_{\alpha,\varepsilon} = y_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \rangle$ for $\varepsilon < \tau$ and without loss of generality $y_{\alpha,\varepsilon} \in p_\alpha$ and choose $\alpha_{\beta,\zeta} \in w[p_\beta]$ for $\zeta < \mu$ such that $y_{\beta,\varepsilon} \in \langle \{x_\gamma : \gamma \in \{\alpha_{\beta,\varepsilon} : \varepsilon < \zeta_\beta\}\} \rangle_{B[p_{\beta_\ell}]}$ for some $\zeta_\beta < \tau^+$ with $\alpha_{\beta,\varepsilon}$ increasing with ε , and let $\xi_\beta \leq \zeta_\beta$ be such that $(\forall \varepsilon)[\alpha_{\beta,\varepsilon} < \beta \equiv \varepsilon < \xi_\beta]$. Let $y_{\beta,\varepsilon} = \sigma_{\beta,\varepsilon}(\dots, x_{\alpha_{\beta,\varepsilon}}, \dots)_{\varepsilon < \zeta_\beta}$ (so the term $\sigma_{\beta,\varepsilon}$ uses only finitely many of its variables). We choose S, w, r , etc., as in the proof there with $\xi \leq \zeta, \langle \alpha_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \xi \rangle, \langle \sigma_\varepsilon : \varepsilon < \tau \rangle$ replacing $m \leq n, \langle \alpha_\ell : \ell < m \rangle, \sigma$.

We choose $\beta_0 < \beta_1 < \beta_2 < \beta_3$ in S and it is enough to find $q \in \mathbb{Q}_{\mu,\lambda}^1$ such that $\ell < 4 \Rightarrow p_{\beta_\ell} \leq q$ and $q \Vdash \langle y_{\beta_0,\varepsilon} = \sigma(y_{\beta_1,\varepsilon}, y_{\beta_2,\varepsilon}, y_{\beta_3,\varepsilon}) \rangle$ for $\varepsilon < \tau$. We define $u = \bigcup_{\ell < 4} w[p_{\beta_\ell}]$ and $\mathcal{F}$ as there, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{f : f \in {}^u 2, f \restriction w[p_{\beta_\ell}] \in \mathcal{F}[p_{\beta_\ell}] \text{ for } \ell < 4 \text{ and for some} \\ & \ell \in \{1, 2, 3\} \text{ we have} \\ & m \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \setminus \{\ell\} \ \& \ \zeta < \mu \Rightarrow f(x_{\alpha_{\beta_0}, \zeta}) = f(x_{\alpha_{\beta_m}, \zeta})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Now check.

2) Straightforward. □_{2.5}

REFERENCES.

- [References of the form **math.XX**/ $\dots$ refer to the **xxx.lanl.gov** archive]
- [FMS_{Sh} 252] Matthew Foreman, Menachem Magidor, and Saharon Shelah. Martin's maximum, saturated ideals and nonregular ultrafilters. II. *Annals of Mathematics. Second Series*, **127**:521–545, 1988.
- [GM] Moti Gitik and Menachem Magidor. The Singular Cardinals Hypothesis revisited. In H. Judah, W. Just, and H. Woodin, editors, *The Proc. of MSRI conference on The Set Theory of the Continuum*, Mathematical Sciences Research Institute Publications, pages 243–380. Springer Verlag, 1992.
- [Mg1] Menachem Magidor. On the singular cardinals problem II. *Annals Math.*, **106**:517–547, 1977.
- [Mg4] Menachem Magidor. Changing cofinality of cardinals. *Fund. Math.*, **XCIX**:61–71, 1978.
- [MgSh 433] Menachem Magidor and Saharon Shelah. Length of Boolean algebras and ultraproducts. *Mathematica Japonica*, **48**(2):301–307, 1998. **math.LO/9805145**
- [M2] J. Donald Monk. *Cardinal Invariants of Boolean Algebras*, volume 142 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Verlag, Basel–Boston–Berlin, 1996.
- [Ru83] Matatyahu Rubin. A Boolean algebra with few subalgebras, interval Boolean algebras and retractiveness. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, **278**:65–89, 1983.
- [Sh:e] Saharon Shelah. *Non-structure theory*, accepted. Oxford University Press.
- [Sh 128] Saharon Shelah. Uncountable constructions for B.A., e.c. groups and Banach spaces. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, **51**:273–297, 1985.
- [Sh:f] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer, 1998.
- [ShSi 677] Saharon Shelah and Otmar Spinas. On incomparability and related cardinal functions on ultraproducts of Boolean algebras. *Mathematica Japonica*, **accepted**. **math.LO/9903116**